arXiv:1704.08286v1 [math.AC] 26 Apr 2017

First Syzygy of Hibi Rings

Priya Das *[1] and Himadri Mukherjee †[2]

[1]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, IISER Kolkata
[2]Department of Mathematics, BITS-Pilani, Goa Campus

April 28, 2017

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a finite distributive lattice and $K[\mathcal{L}] = K[x_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{L}]$ be the polynomial ring over K and $I_\mathcal{L} = \langle x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha\vee\beta}x_{\alpha\wedge\beta} : \alpha \nsim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}\rangle$ be the ideal of $K[\mathcal{L}]$. In this article we describe the first syzygy of Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}] = K[\mathcal{L}]/I_\mathcal{L}$, for a distributive lattice. We also derive an exact formula for the first betti number of a planar distributive lattice.

Keywords: Free resolution, Syzygies, Hibi rings, Gröbner basis

1 Introduction

Let P be a partially ordered set with operation $x \vee y (= \inf\{z : z \geq x, y\})$ and $x \wedge y (= \sup\{z : z \leq x, y\})$ defined one can associate a K-algebra as a quotient of $K[x_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{L}]$ by the ideal $I_\mathcal{L} = \langle x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha\vee\beta}x_{\alpha\wedge\beta} : \alpha \nsim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}\rangle$. Hibi in the year 1987 considered the question of classifying the Gorenstein rings arrising out of finite partial ordered sets as algebras with streightening laws. The Hodge algebras considered by De Concini[12] being one of the motivation. In [8] Hibi showed that $I_\mathcal{L}$ is prime if and only if $\mathcal{L}$ is distributive (i.e. $(x \vee y) \wedge z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$) and further he shows that the algebra $R[\mathcal{L}] = K[\mathcal{L}]/I_\mathcal{L}$ is Gorenstein when the set of join irreducible $J = \{z \in \mathcal{L} : x \vee y = z, \Rightarrow x = z \text{ or } y = z\}$ is pure. In the article [4] the authors describes a standard monomial basis for the lattice ring $R[\mathcal{L}]$. The lattice ring $R[\mathcal{L}]$ appears in geometric context in the works of Lakshmibai and Gonciulea [15] who show that Schubert varieties in $G_{d,n}$ degenerate flatly to toric varieties $X(I_{d,n})(= X_{d,n}$ in their notation) which are the affine varieties associated to the lattice $I_{d,n} = \{\underline{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_d) : 1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_d \leq n\}$. Using the degeneration they derive several geometric properties for the schubert varieties. They also initiated the study of the singularities of $X(I_{d,n})$. The question of singularity of the algebraic varieties associated to a lattice $\mathcal{L}$, namely Spec$K[\mathcal{L}]$ is dealt with in the paper by D.G. Wagner in 1995 [17] and the second author of this paper in [10]. In the paper[10] Lakshmibai and H. Mukherjee demonostrated a standard monomial basis for the lattice varieties at a singular point. In a series of successive papers as in [19][20] they consider several classes of lattices and find interesting multiplicity formulas and other applications. Study of Hilbert series and Hilbert polynomial through a free resolutions of modules started with the seminal Hilbert syzygy theorem[16]. Since then the theory has attracted a lot of attention by mathematician for both commutative algebra and algebraic geometry aspects. In the paper[13] Seshadri, Lakshmibai et. al. have given free resolution of Schubert singularities using Kempf- Lascoux-Weyman geometric technique. The authors in [21] have done the same for the

*Corresponding author, email: priya.math88@gmail.com
†himadrim@goa.bits-pilani.ac.in

Schubert varieties. Not much is known about free resolution of the Hibi rings, a good source of results can be found in [5]. The regularity of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is $|J|$- rank $J-1$,where J is the set of join irreducible elements of distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$, [[11],theorem 1.1], and it has a linear resolution if J is the direct sum of a chain and an isolated element. In particular, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a simple planar distributive lattice, $\mathcal{L} \subset [(0,0),(m,n)]$ with $m,n \geqslant 2$, in [5] they give the conditions when the ideal $I_{\mathcal{L}}$ is linearly related and when it has a pure resolutions.
In this paper we have found the first syzygy of Hibi rings in terms of a collocetion of sublattices in $\mathcal{L}$. These sublattices can be thought of as images of lattice homomorphisms from the free lattice generated by four elements. When this sublattice is image of a free lattice of three elements, the resulting generators of the syzygies are linear. We have identified explicitly the planar lattices which have linear first syzygy. The result is dependent on the number of join-meet irreducible pairs in the lattice, that are non comparable. In the following section we quote the main theorems, the notations involved can be found in the cross references therein.

2 Main Theorems

Theorem 2.1. *(See, 4.13) The first syzygy of Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}] = K[\mathcal{L}]/I$ for a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is generated by the types $S_1, S_2, L, B_1, B_2, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_6, G, D$.*

Where S_1, S_2 coming from a sublattice (11), see, (4.2), similarly other types of generators can be found from the lemmas (4.3), (4.4), (4.5), (4.6), (4.7), (4.8), (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12) respectively. We call S_1 as a strip type 1, S_2 as a strip type 2, L as L-type, B_1 as a box type 1, B_2 as a box type 2, D as a diamond type.
Let $F_4 = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 : i = 1,2\rangle$ denote free lattice generated by $\alpha_i, \beta_i, i = 1,2$. For $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, we say these two diamonds are comparable if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \alpha_2, \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$. If at least one of these pairs is not comparable we say $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2)$ are non- comparable. then we have the following theorem

Lemma 2.2. *(See, 5.16) Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, the diamond type arrising out of these two diamonds is expressed by strip, L, box types (infact only L-type) if only if*

1. *the diamonds are non-comparable or,*
2. *there exist a diamond $(\alpha_3,\beta_3) \in \mathcal{D}_2$ such that there is a sublattice (19)*

Theorem 2.3. *(See, 5.17) Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a planar distributive lattice such that the lemma(5.16) holds. Then the first syzygy of the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is linear.*

Theorem 2.4. *(See, 5.18) Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a planar distributive lattice then the first Betti number $\beta_1(L)$ of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is*

$$\beta_1(\mathcal{L}) = n(S) + n(L) + n(B) + n(D).$$

Where $n(S)$ denote the number of strip type generators, $n(L)$ denote the number of L-type generators, $n(B)$ denote the number of box type generators, $n(D)$ denote the number of diamond type generators.
Let JM be the set of all join-meet irreducible elements and let us denote $k(\mathcal{L}) = \#\{(\theta_i,\theta_j) : \theta_i \nsim \theta_j, \theta_i, \theta_j \in JM\}$ then we have

Theorem 2.5. *(See, 5.19) With above notations we have the following*

1. *If $k(\mathcal{L}) = 1$, then the first syzygy of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is linear.*
2. *When $k(\mathcal{L}) = 2$,*
   (a) *If the lattice is (21), then first syzygy is non linear.*
   (b) *Else if the lattice is (22) then first syzygy is linear if and only if $ht(\theta_2 \wedge \theta_3) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2) = 1$ or $ht(\theta_2 \vee \theta_3) - ht(\theta_1 \vee \theta_2) = 1$, where $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in JM$.*

3 Preliminaries

Basic definitions and results on partial ordered set and distributive lattices can be obtained from [14] and [6]. Let us recall some basic facts on free free resolution. A general treatment can be obtained from standard textbooks such as [2],[3]. Let $S = K[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$ be the polynomial ring of n-variables over a field K.

- The ring S is *graded* by degree in the following manner, if $S = \oplus_{d \geqslant 0} S_d$, where S_d is the set of all homogeneous polynomials of degree d.
- A *free resolution* $\mathbb{F}$ of an S-module M is an exact sequence of homomorphisms of S-modules

$$\mathbb{F} : \ldots F_i \xrightarrow{\phi_i} F_{i-1} \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow F_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_1} F_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_0} M \longrightarrow 0$$

  F_i which are free i.e. $F_i = \oplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-d_j)^{\beta_{ij}}, \forall i$. It is called graded free resolution if the maps ϕ_i's preserve the degrees.

- Let $\mathbf{m} = \langle x_1, x_2, ..., x_n \rangle$ be an ideal of S. A graded free resolution of a finitely generated S-module M is called *minimal* if

$$\phi_{i+1}(F_{i+1}) \subseteq \mathbf{m} F_i, \forall i$$

  i.e. all the matrices of the maps ϕ_i have entries in $\mathbf{m}$.

- The minimal free resoltion is called *linear* if all the entries of the matrices are linear.
- A minimal free resolution of a S-module M is called *pure* if M has a minimal system of generators and it is of the following form

$$0 \longrightarrow S(-d_p)^{\beta_p} \to \ldots \to S(-d_1)^{\beta_1} \to S(-d_0)^{\beta_0} \to M \to 0$$

  where $0 < d_0 < d_1 < ... < d_p$ and $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

$$\mathbb{F} : \longrightarrow F_i \xrightarrow{\phi_i} F_{i-1} \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow F_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_1} F_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_0} M \longrightarrow 0$$

where $F_i = \oplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-d_j)^{\beta_{ij}}, \forall i$.

- The numbers β_{ij} are called the *graded Betti numbers* of M and the numbers $\beta_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_{ij}$ are called the ith *total Betti numbers* of M.

The submodule $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi_{i-1})$ of F_{i-1} is called the ith syzygy module of M and is denoted by $Syz_i(M)$ and the elements of it are called *syzygies*. The minimal number of generators of the ith syzygy module $\mathrm{Syz}_i(M)$ in a minimal graded free resolution $\mathbb{F}$ is the $\mathrm{rank}(F_i)$. Now we recall some concept of Gröbner bases theory.

- Let F be a free S-module with basis. A monomial order on F is a total order $>$ on the monomials of F such that if m_1, m_2 are monomials of F and n is a monomial of S then $m_1 > m_2 \Rightarrow nm_1 > nm_2 > m_2$ and $cm_1 > dm_2$ if $m_1 > m_2$.
- For a given monomial order on F and $f \in F$, we define $in_>(f)$ is the initial term of f and if M is a submodule of F then $in_>(M) = \{in_>(f) : f \in M\}$ and if $\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m\}$ generating set of M such that $\{in_>(g_1), \ldots, in_>(g_m)\}$ generates $in_>(M)$ then we call $\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m\}$ a Gröbner basis with respect to $>$.

- Reverse lexicographic order: $m >_{rlex} n$ if and only if $deg(m) > deg(n)$ or $deg(m) = deg(n)$ and $a_i < b_i$ for the last index i with $a_i \neq b_i$.
- We order linearly the variables $K[\mathcal{L}]$ such that $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$ if $\alpha \leq \beta$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and we consider the reverse lexicographic order $<$ on $K[\mathcal{L}]$ induced by this order of the variables.

Theorem 3.0.1 ([9], Theorem 10.1.3)**.** *The generators of $I_\mathcal{L}$ form the reduced Gröbner basis of $I_\mathcal{L}$ with respect to $<$.*

- Let $\{g_1, g_2, ..., g_m\}$ be a Gröbner basis of an ideal $I \subset K[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$ with respect to monomial order $>$. For every $i \neq j$ the S-polynomial $S(g_i, g_j)$ is defined as

$$S(g_i, g_j) = \frac{x^\gamma}{in(g_i)} g_i - \frac{x^\gamma}{in(g_j)} g_j$$

  where $x^\gamma = LCM(in(g_i), in(g_j))$ and $in(g_i), in(g_j)$ be the leading monomials of g_i, g_j respectively.

Theorem 3.0.2 (See, [7])**. (Schreyer's Theorem)** *Let $\{g_1, g_2, ..., g_m\}$ be a gröbner basis with respect to monomial order $>$. Let $>$ be a monomial order on $\oplus_{j=1}^m S\varepsilon_j$ defined by taking $m\varepsilon_i > n\varepsilon_j$ if and only if $in(mg_i) > in(ng_j)$ with respect to the given order on f or $in(mg_i) = in(ng_j)$ and $i < j$. Then $S(g_i, g_j)$ generate the syzygy on the g_i. Infact $S(g_i, g_j)$ are Gröbner basis for the syzygies with respect to the order $>$.*

To find Gröbner bases and syzygies we can use Buchberger's algorithm (see 15.9 [1]). In the following section we will find syzygies of Hibi ring of a distributive lattices. The generators of $I_\mathcal{L}$ form a reduced gröbner bases of $I_\mathcal{L}$ with respect to reverse lexicographic order $<$. In [8], Hibi showed that $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is Cohen-Macaulay normal domain. Also the authors Viviana Ene et. al in [18] found the regularity of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ for planar and non-planar distributive lattices. The theorem from [5] shows when the ideal $I_\mathcal{L}$ is linearly related and when it has a pure resolutions.

4 Types of the elements of first syzygy

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a finite distributive lattice. $K[\mathcal{L}] = K[x_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{L}]$ be the polynomial ring with $|\mathcal{L}|$ variables and $I = I_\mathcal{L} = \langle x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha\vee\beta} x_{\alpha\wedge\beta} : \alpha \nsim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}\rangle$ be the ideal generated by the diamond relations $f_{(\alpha,\beta)} = x_\alpha x_\beta - x_{\alpha\vee\beta} x_{\alpha\wedge\beta}$, where $\alpha \nsim \beta$, and we say it is coming from the diamond $(\alpha, \beta) = \{\alpha, \beta, \alpha \vee \beta, \alpha \wedge \beta\}$ and $R[\mathcal{L}] = K[\mathcal{L}]/I$ the Hibi ring. Let $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n$ be all the diamond relations in I. Let us denote $S = \oplus_{i=1}^n K[\mathcal{L}](-2)$ and $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n$ be the generators of $\oplus_{i=1}^n K[\mathcal{L}](-2)$. $\phi : S \longrightarrow K[\mathcal{L}]$, $g_i \longmapsto f_i$, $\ker(\phi)$ is the first syzygy of $R[\mathcal{L}]$.

If we have two relations $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}$ and $f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_2} x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2} x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}$ coming from the diamonds (α_1, β_1) and (α_2, β_2) respectively. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, we have $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_2} x_{\beta_2}$. Then we have the following possibilities

1. $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_1 = \beta_2$ or $\beta_1 = \alpha_2$ or $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.
2. $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ all are different.

Without loss of generality, let us suppose that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, for the case (1). Then we have $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_2}$ and therefore, $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1} x_{\beta_2}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2} f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1} f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} \\ =& x_{\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} \end{aligned}$$

Then the following cases arises

4.1 All types of S-polynomials

We have that $\mathrm{S}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}$.
Then there are the following possibilities

(i) $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$

(ii) $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$

(iii) $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$

(iv) $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.

Also we have either $\beta_1 \nsim \beta_2$ or $\beta_1 \sim \beta_2$, say $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$. Now since $\alpha_1 \nsim \beta_1, \alpha_1 \nsim \beta_2$ then $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$ not possible. From above we get for example the following conditions

(a) $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$

(b) $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$

(c) $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$.

and we see that the case (c) is the subcase of case (a) and (b), so we can discard this type of cases. Therefore, investigating all cases we reach only the following cases

1. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
2. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
3. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
4. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
5. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
6. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
7. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
8. $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
9. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
10. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
11. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
12. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
13. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
14. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
15. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$
16. $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$

Under the above cases we will check in the following a lattice exist or not.

- **Case I:** When $\beta_1 \nsim \beta_2$

– **Subcase I:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$. This subcase condition implies that $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, which contradics the condition $\beta_1 \nsim \beta_2$. Hence we do not have to check the above sixteen cases under this subcase.

– **Subcase II:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.

  * Check for $(1) - (8)$: Since $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$, this gives a contradiction.
  * Check for $(9) - (10), (13) - (14)$: Since $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, this gives a contradiction.
  * Check for (11): We get the following lattice



Figure 1:

  * Check for $(12), (16)$: These two conditions gives $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.
  * Check for (15): From the given conditions we have $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2)$ (since, $\alpha_1 \wedge (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2) = (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1) \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$, as $\beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$) and $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2)$, these two implies $\beta_1 = \beta_1 \vee \beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_1 \geq \beta_2$, which contradicts $\beta_1 \nsim \beta_2$. Hence under this condition lattice does not exist.

– **Subcase III:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.

  * Check for $(1) - (4), (9) - (12)$: Since $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$, this gives contradiction.
  * Check for $(5), (7), (13), (15)$: Since $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, this gives a contradiction.
  * Check for (6): We get the following lattice



Figure 2:

- Check for (8): We have $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \wedge (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2), \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \vee (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$, (since $(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, as $\beta_2 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$). This implies $\beta_2 = \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_2 \leq \beta_1$, this is a contradiction.
- Check for (14): We have $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$ and $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$,(since, $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$), which implies $\beta_1 = \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.
- Check for (16): The condition implies $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.

– **Subcase IV:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.

- Check for (1): We get the following lattice



Figure 3:

where $M = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) \wedge (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2) = (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1) \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) \vee (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$.

- Check for (2): We get the following lattice



Figure 4:

$*$ Check for (3): We get the following lattice



Figure 5:

$*$ Check for (4): We get the following lattice



Figure 6:

∗ Check for (5): We get the following lattice



Figure 7:

∗ Check for (6), (8), (14), (16): By the given condition we have $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.

∗ Check for (7):We have $\alpha_1 \wedge [\beta_1 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2)] = \alpha_1 \wedge [\beta_2 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1)] = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$ and $\alpha_1 \vee [\beta_1 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2)] = \alpha_1 \vee [\beta_2 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1)] = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, both implies $\beta_1 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) = \beta_2 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1)$. Now $(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) \vee (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2) = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$ and $(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) \wedge (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2) = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2) \wedge \beta_1 = \beta_2 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1) = \beta_1 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2)$, this gives $\beta_1 = \beta_1 \vee \beta_2$, so, $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2$, which gives a contradiction. Therefore, for this case lattice does not exists.

∗ Check for (9): We get the following lattice



Figure 8:

- Check for (10): Using the given conditions we have $\alpha_1 \wedge [\beta_1 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2)] = \alpha_1 \wedge [\beta_2 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)] = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$ and $\alpha_1 \vee [\beta_1 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2)] = \alpha_1 \vee [\beta_2 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)] = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$. This implies $\beta_1 \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) = \beta_2 \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)$. Again we have $(\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2) = (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$ and $(\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) \vee (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2) = (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2) \vee \beta_1$. Hence $\beta_1 = \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2$ this implies $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.
- Check for $(11) - (12), (15)$: By the given condition we have $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.
- Check for (13): We get the following lattice



Figure 9:

- **Case II:** When $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$
  - **Subcase I:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$. This subcase condition implies that $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, which contradics the condition $\beta_1 \nsim \beta_2$. Hence we do not have to check the above sixteen cases under this subcase.
  - **Subcase II:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.
    - Check for $(1) - (8)$: Since $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$, this gives a contradiction.
    - Check for $(9) - (10), (13) - (14)$: Since $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, this gives a contradiction.

* Check for (11): Since $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, this contradicts that $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$.
* Check for (12): By the given conditions we get the following lattice



Figure 10:

* Check for $(15) - (16)$: Since $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ and $\beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, this implies $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.

– **Subcase III:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.
* Check for $(1) - (8)$: Since $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, this contradicts $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$.
* Check for $(9) - (12)$: Since $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$, this gives contradiction.
* Check for $(13), (15)$: Since $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, this gives contradiction.
* Check for (14): We get the following lattice



Figure 11:

* Check for (16): By the given conditions we have $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.

– **Subcase IV:** When $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$.
* Check for $(1) - (8)$: Since $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, this contradicts that $\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$.
* Check for $(9), (11), (13), (15)$: Since $\beta_2 \wedge (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1) = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$, this implies that $\beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$, which is a contradiction.
* Check for (10): We get the following lattice



Figure 12:

- $*$ Check for (12), (16): The given conditions implies $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.
- $*$ Check for (14): The given condtions implies $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, which is a contradiction.

Remark:

1. In fig(10), if we take $\beta_1 = \alpha_1, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 = \beta_1, \alpha_1 = \beta_2$, then the fig(10) become fig(11).
2. The condtions of fig(6) and (9) are the symmetry of β_1 and β_2, so we can choose one of them, without loss of generality we will take the conditions of fig(9).

Now using the conditions of the cases (for which lattice exists), we prove that the following are the types of the generators of the first syzygy of the Hibi ring. Let us denote $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \nsim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Infact, $\mathcal{D}_2 = Hom(F_2, \mathcal{L})$ non trivial homomorphism where $F_2 = \langle \alpha, \beta : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L} \rangle$.

Lemma 4.2. (***Strip-type***) *Let $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_1, \beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(11) with conditions $\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$ the following are the generators of the first syzygy*

1. $S_1 = -x_{\beta_2} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} + x_{\beta_1} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} g_{(\beta_2, \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)}$.
2. $S_2 = x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} - x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1} g_{(\beta_2, \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)}$.

Proof:

1. Let $f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)}$ be the relations corresponding to $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_1, \beta_2)$ respectively such that $f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1} x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2} x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1} x_{\beta_1} x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned} S(f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)}) &= x_{\beta_2} f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1} f_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)} \\ &= x_{\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2} x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} - x_{\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1} x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} \\ &= -x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} (x_{\beta_2} x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1} - x_{\beta_1} x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_2}) \\ &= -x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} f_{(\beta_2, \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)} \end{aligned}$$

As $\beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$. Hence $-x_{\beta_2} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} + x_{\beta_1} g_{(\alpha_1, \beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} g_{(\beta_2, \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)}$ is a generator of the first syzygy.

2. Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}, f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}$ be the relations corresponding to $(\alpha_1,\beta_2),(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)$ respectively, therefore $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}, f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} = x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}) = x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}, f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}) =& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} \\ =& x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} \\ =& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}) \\ =& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}$ is a generator of the first syzygy.

Lemma 4.3. (***L-type***) *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(12) with conditions $\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \alpha_1\vee\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$ the following is a generator of the first syzygy*

$$L = -x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} + x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}.$$

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}$ be the relations corresponding to $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)$ respectively such that $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned} S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} \\ =& x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} \\ =& -x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_2\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}) + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} \\ & - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}) \\ =& -x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} \end{aligned}$$

Where the third equality follows as $\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2) = \beta_2\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)$. Hence $-x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} + x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}$ is a generator of the first syzygy.

Lemma 4.4. (***Box-type***) *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(9) with conditions $\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \alpha_1\vee\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$ the following are the generators of the first syzygy*

1. $B_1 = -x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} + x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}$.
2. $B_2 = -x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1}g_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)} + x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1\wedge\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1),(\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}$.

Proof:

1. Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}$ be the relations corresponding to $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)$ respectively such that $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned} S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} \\ =& x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} \\ =& -x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}) \\ & - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1}) \\ =& -x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

2. Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}, f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}$ be the relations corresponding to $(\alpha_1,\beta_2),(\beta_1,\beta_2)$ respectively. Therefore, $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$ and $f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}, f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}, f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1}f_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\
=& x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1})\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2})\\
=& x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1\wedge\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(2) with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1=\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1\geq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2\geq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, the following is a generator of first syzygy*

$$G_1 = x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}$$

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(1) with conditions $\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \alpha_1\vee\beta_1=\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\beta_2, \beta_1\leq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2\leq\alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$ the following is a generator of first syzygy*

$$G_2 = x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}$$

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} - x_{\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(8) then with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\beta_2, \beta_1\leq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, the following is a generator of the first syzygy*

$$\begin{aligned}
G_3 =& x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}$. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_2}$. $\text{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} + x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\
=& - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} - x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)})\\
=& - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)} + x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(7) then with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, the following is a generator of the first syzygy*

$$\begin{aligned}
G_4 =& x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1,\beta_1\wedge\beta_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: Using the given conditions we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} + x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\
=& - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)})\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\beta_1\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2})\\
=& - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1,\beta_1\wedge\beta_2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(4) then with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1\wedge\beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, the following is a generator of first syzygy*

$$\begin{aligned}
G_5 =& x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}g_{(\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2),\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: Using the given conditions we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}, f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}) =& x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\
=& - x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1} + x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)})\\
&- x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1} - x_{\beta_2\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2})\\
&+ x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_2\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)})\\
=& x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)} - x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)} + x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2),\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(5) then with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2,\beta_2\leq\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, then the following is a generator of first syzygy*

$$\begin{aligned}G_6=&x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}+x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}\\&-x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)},f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)})=&x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\=&-x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}+x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\=&x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}-x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\&-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}-x_{\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\&+x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\beta_1\vee\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)})\\=&x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}+x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\beta_1\vee\beta_2)}\end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_1,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, for every sublattice isomorphic to fig(3) then with conditions $\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\neq\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_2,\beta_1\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2,\beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\vee\beta_1,\beta_2\nsim\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1$, then the following is a generator of first syzygy*

$$\begin{aligned}G=&x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\beta_1}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}+x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}g_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}-\\&x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2),\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}+x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}g_{(\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1),\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)},f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)})=&x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_2)}\\=&-x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}+x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}\\=&x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2}-x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\&-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}(x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}-x_{\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2})\\&+x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_M)\\&-x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1\vee\beta_2}x_M)\\=&x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2)}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}f_{(\beta_2,\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1)}+x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\beta_1\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_2),\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)}\\&-x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\beta_2\vee(\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1),\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)}\end{aligned}$$

Where $M=(\alpha_1\vee\beta_1)\wedge(\alpha_1\vee\beta_2)\wedge(\beta_1\vee\beta_2)$.

Lemma 4.12. (***Diamond-type***) *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2)\in\mathcal{D}_2$, where $\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta_1,\beta_2$ all are distincts and $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)},f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}$ be the relations of the pairs $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2)$ respectively. If there does not exist $a,b\in\mathcal{L}$ such that $a\wedge b=\beta_1,a\vee b=\beta_2$ then the following is a generator of first syzygy and we call it as a diamond type*

$$D=(x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2})g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1})g_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}.$$

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}=x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}$ and $f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}=x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}$. Then $\mathrm{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)})=x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\mathrm{in}(f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)})=x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}$ and $\mathrm{Lcm}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)},f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)})=x_{\alpha_1}x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_1}x_{\beta_2}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}S(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)},f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)})=&x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}\\=&x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}\\=&x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1})\\&-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}(x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2})\\=&x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}-x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2})g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}-(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}-x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1})g_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}$ is a generator of the syzygy.

Theorem 4.13. *The first syzygy of Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}] = K[\mathcal{L}]/I$ for a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is generated by the types $S_1, S_2, L, B_1, B_2, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_6, G, D$.*

Proof: Let $f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1}, f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)} = x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2}$ be the relation coming from the diamonds $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2)$. Therefore with respect to monomial ordering $>$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1}$, $\text{in}(f_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}) = x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2}$. Then by the all lemmas (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), (4.5), (4.6), (4.7), (4.8), (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), we have that the first syzygy of Hibi ring is generated by $S_1, S_2, L, B_1, B_2, G_1, \ldots, G, D$. Hence the theorem follows.

Remark: Although Schreyer's theorem gives a Gröbner basis for the first syzygy, as a result of the above described types being a strict subset of set of all S-polynomials, these are no longer a Gröbner basis, as we demonostrate in the following example.

Example:



Figure 13:

In the figure(13), the ring is $A = K[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6]$ and $I = \langle f_1 = x_2x_3 - x_1x_4, f_2 = x_2x_5 - x_1x_6, f_3 = x_4x_5 - x_3x_6\rangle$. Now with respect to monomial order $>$(3) we have $\text{in}(f_1) = x_2x_3$, $\text{in}(f_2) = x_2x_5$, $\text{in}(f_3) = x_4x_5$. The map $\phi : A(-2)^3 \longrightarrow A$ such that $g_i \longmapsto f_i, i = 1, 2$, where g_i's are the generators of $A(-2)$. The $\ker(\phi)$ is the first syzygy of R. We have $S_1 = x_5g_{(2,3)} - x_3g_{(2,5)} + x_1g_{(4,5)}, S_2 = -x_6g_{(2,3)} + x_4g_{(2,5)} - x_2g_{(4,5)}$ are the generators of the first syzygy. Now $\text{in}(S_1) = x_1g_{(4,5)}$, $\text{in}(S_2) = -x_2g_{(4,5)}$. Therefore, $S(S_1, S_2) = -x_2S_1 - x_1S_2 = (-x_2x_5 + x_1x_6)g_{(2,3)} + (x_2x_3 - x_1x_4)g_{(2,5)}$. So our generators S_1, S_2 are not the Gröbner basis as we said in above remark.

Theorem 4.14. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ all are distincts and $\alpha_1, \beta_1 < \alpha_2, \beta_2$. If there exists $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $a\wedge b = \beta_1, a\vee b = \beta_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, a \nsim b, \alpha_2\wedge b \nsim \alpha_1\vee\beta_1$, then the generator of the first syzygy from these two diamonds is a combination of other types of the generators.*

Proof:The proof follows from the following lemmas (4.15) and (4.16).

Lemma 4.15. *With the same notation as lemma(4.14), if a and b are like (14) then the following identities holds:*

1. $x = \alpha_2 \wedge b = (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2 \wedge b)$.
2. $\beta_1 < x < b$, *where* $x = (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b$.
3. $x \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \wedge x = \beta_1$.
4. $a \vee x = \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2$.
5. $a \wedge x = \beta_1$.
6. $y = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x = \alpha_1 \vee x$.

7. $y \wedge b = x$, *where* $y = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x$.

8. $a \vee y = \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2$.

9. $a \wedge y = \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1$.

10. $(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee b = \alpha_1 \vee b = z$.

11. $(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge z = y$, *where* $z = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee b$.

12. $(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \vee z = \beta_2$.



Figure 14:

Proof: In this figure(14), we have $a \wedge b = \beta_1$ and $a \vee b = \beta_2$. Now we prove that there exist $x, y, z \in \mathcal{L}$ such that the following holds.

1. Let $\alpha_2 \wedge b = x_1, (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b = x$. Now since $x_1 \vee \beta_2 = (\alpha_2 \wedge b) \vee \beta_2 = \beta_2, x \vee \beta_2 = ((\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b) \vee \beta_2 = \beta_2, x_1 \wedge \beta_2 = (\alpha_2 \wedge b) \wedge \beta_2 = \alpha_2 \wedge b, x \wedge \beta_2 = ((\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b) = \alpha_2 \wedge b$ then it implies $x = x_1$.

2. We have $x = (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b$. Let $(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b = b$. Then $\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2 \geq b$. Since $\alpha_1 > a, \beta_1 > b$, then $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 > a \vee b = \beta_2$. Which is a contradiction. Hence it follows.

3. By the given conditions, we have $x \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \wedge x = (\alpha_1 \wedge x) \vee (\beta_1 \wedge x) = (\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1) \vee \beta_1 = \beta_1$.

4. $a \vee x = a \vee [(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b] = (a \vee b) \wedge [a \vee (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2)] = \beta_2 \wedge (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) = \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2$.

5. $a \wedge x = a \wedge [(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b] = \beta_1 \wedge (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) = \beta_1$.

6. Clearly it follows.

7. $[(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x] \wedge b = [(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \wedge b] \vee (x \wedge b) = \beta_1 \vee x = x$.

8. $a \vee [(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x] = [a \vee (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x = a \vee x = \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2$.

9. $a \wedge [(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x] = (a \wedge x) \vee [a \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)] = \beta_1 \vee (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) = \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1$.
10. Clearly it follows.
11. $(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge [(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee b] = [(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1)] \vee [(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge b] = (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee x = y$.
12. $(\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \vee [(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) \vee b] = (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \vee (\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1) = (\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \vee b = \beta_2$.

Lemma 4.16. *In the following figure(15), if $f_{(2,3)}, f_{(11,12)}$ be the relations coming from the diamonds $(2,3),(11,12)$ respectively. Then the diamond type arrising out of these two diamonds can be expressed as a combination of L-shape syzygies.*



Figure 15:

Proof: Let $f_{(2,3)} = x_2x_3 - x_1x_4$ and $f_{(11,12)} = x_{11}x_{12} - x_9x_{13}$ be the relations coming from the diamonds $(2,3)$ and $(11,12)$ respectively. Then with respect to monomial ordering $>$ we have $\text{in}(f_{(2,3)}) = x_2x_3$ and $\text{in}(f_{(11,12)}) = x_{11}x_{12}$. So $\text{Lcm}(f_{(2,3)}, f_{(11,12)}) = x_2x_3x_{11}x_{12}$. $S(f_{(2,3)}, f_{(11,12)}) = x_{11}x_{12}f_{(2,3)} - x_2x_3f_{(11,12)} = x_2x_3x_9x_{13} - x_1x_4x_{11}x_{12} = x_9x_{13}f_1 - x_1x_4f_6$. Therefore $(x_{11}x_{12} - x_9x_{13})g_{(2,3)} - (x_2x_3 - x_1x_4)g_{(11,12)}$ gives a element of the first syzygy. Now this expression can be written as $(x_{11}x_{12} - x_9x_{13})g_{(2,3)} - (x_2x_3 - x_1x_4)g_{(11,12)} = x_{11}(x_{12}g_{(2,3)} - x_6g_{(2,8)} + x_2g_{(6,8)} - x_1g_{(6,10)}) - x_{13}(x_9g_{(2,3)} - x_6g_{(2,5)} + x_2g_{(5,6)} - x_1g_{(6,7)}) + x_6(x_{13}g_{(2,5)} - x_{11}g_{(2,8)} + x_2g_{(8,11)} - x_1g_{(10,11)}) + x_2(x_{13}g_{(5,6)} - x_{11}g_{(6,8)} + x_6g_{(8,11)} - x_3g_{(11,12)}) - x_1(x_{13}g_{(6,7)} - x_{11}g_{(6,10)} + x_6g_{(10,11)} - x_4g_{(11,12)})$ which shows that it is a combination of four L-type elements. Hence the lemma follows for this case. Let us quote the condition of the syzygy G by

$$\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \beta_2 \tag{1}$$

$$\beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_2, \beta_1 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \beta_2 \nsim \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1. \tag{2}$$

For all $\psi \in Hom(F_4, \mathcal{L})$ there is a generator, where $F_4 = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \rangle$. and $\psi(\alpha_i) = \alpha_i, \psi(\beta_i) = \beta_i, i = 1, 2$. Let $Syz^1(R[\mathcal{L}])$ denote the first syzygy, then we have the following theorem

Theorem 4.17. *There is a map which is given by $Hom(F_4, \mathcal{L}) \longrightarrow Syz^1(R[\mathcal{L}])$*

$$\psi \longmapsto \begin{cases} G, & \text{if (1),(2) and } \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \\ (x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_2 \vee \beta_2}x_{\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2})g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} & \\ -(x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1}x_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1})g_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}, & \text{if (4.14) does not hold} \end{cases}$$

Proof: Which is follows from above lemmas.
Remark: Every generators of the syzygy (i.e. strip, L, box) for a planar distributive lattice can be embedded to a sublattice B (i.e the figure 9). Which can also see by the following figure.



Remark: One can observe that the first Betti number β_1 of the Hibi ring for a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$\beta_1 \leq |Hom(F_4, \mathcal{L})|.$$

Proof: The first betti number is nothing but the rank of the first syzygy module so from the theorem(4.17) it follows.

5 Betti number discussion for a planar lattice

5.1 $m \times n-$ grid Lattice

Let C_{m+1} be the chain $1 < 2 < \ldots < m+1$, $G(m,n) = C_{m+1} \times C_{n+1}$ be the product lattice, we call $G(m,n)$ an $m \times n$ a grid lattice.

Theorem 5.2. *The first syzygy of Hibi ring for an $m \times n$ grid lattice is generated by strip type, L-type, box type.*

Proof: We have the generators except strip type, L-type, box type and diamond type are coming from non planer lattices. But by theorem (4.14) we have that diamond type will not appear in the $m \times n$ grid lattice. Hence the theorem follows.

Now we give an exact formula for the first Betti number of the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}]$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is an $m \times n$ grid distributive lattice.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $T(n)$ be the number of strip type generators for $R[\mathcal{L}]$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is a $1 \times n$ grid lattice. Then*

$$T(n) = 2\tbinom{n+1}{3}.$$

Proof: So we have the lattice $1 \times n$ grid. We know that strip type generators from a lattice coming from every two diamonds which have a common side. Therefore, we have the following

$$T(n) = 2T(n-1) - T(n-2) + 2(n-1)$$

So, clearly $T(n) = 2\tbinom{n+1}{3}$.

Now we find strip type generators for the $m \times n$ grid lattice.

Lemma 5.4. *For the $m \times n$ grid lattice the total number of strip type generators we denote it by $S(m,n)$ is the following*

$$S(m,n) = \tbinom{m+1}{2}T(n) + \tbinom{n+1}{2}T(m),$$

where $T(m)$ and $T(n)$ are the number of srtip type generators for the lattices $1 \times n$ and $1 \times m$ respectively.

Proof: The strip type generators from $m \times n$ grid lattice is

$$(m + (m-1) + \ldots + 1)T(n) + (n + (n-1) + \ldots + 1)T(m) = \tbinom{m+1}{2}T(m) + \tbinom{n+1}{2}T(m).$$

Now we find the number of L-type generators for the $2 \times n$ grid lattice and using this we will find the number of L-type generators for $m \times n$ grid lattice.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $L(2,n)$ be the number of L-type generators for $2 \times n$ grid lattice. Then*

$$L(2,n) = \tfrac{n(n^2-1)}{3}.$$

Proof: We see that

$$\begin{aligned} L(2,n) &= 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}(n+1-i)(i-1) \\ &= \frac{n(n^2-1)}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.6. *The total number of L-type generators we denote it by $L(m,n)$ for the $m \times n$ grid lattice is the following*

$$L(m,n) = \tfrac{L(2,m)L(2,n)}{2}.$$

Proof: We see that the total number is

$$\begin{aligned} L(m,n) &= \sum_{i=0}^{m}(m+1-i)(i-1)L(2,n) \\ &= \frac{m(m^2-1)}{6}L(2,n) \\ &= \frac{L(2,m)L(2,n)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.7. *The total number of box type generators we denote it by $B(m,n)$ for the $m \times n$ grid lattice is the following*

$$B(m,n) = \tfrac{B(2,m)B(2,n)}{2}.$$

Proof: Since in a 2×2 grid lattice the number of box type is same as number of L-type generators, hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 5.8. *The Betti number β_1 of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ for the $m \times n$ grid lattice is the following*

$$\beta_1 = S(m,n) + L(m,n) + B(m,n).$$

Proof: As by above lemma, first syzygy is generated by L-type, box type and strip type, so the total betti number is the sum of all numbers. Hence the lemma follows.

5.9 Example



Figure 16:

If we consider the above 2×3 planer grid lattice then the corresponding ring is $K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{12}]$ and $I = \langle x_2x_3 - x_1x_5, x_2x_6 - x_1x_8, x_2x_9 - x_1x_{11}, x_3x_4 - x_1x_7, x_4x_5 - x_2x_7, x_4x_6 - x_1x_{10}, x_4x_8 - x_2x_{10}, x_4x_9 - x_1x_{12}, x_4x_{11} - x_2x_{12}, x_5x_6 - x_3x_8, x_5x_9 - x_3x_{11}, x_6x_7 - x_3x_{10}, x_7x_8 - x_5x_{10}, x_7x_9 - x_3x_{12}, x_7x_{11} - x_5x_{12}, x_8x_9 - x_6x_{11}, x_9x_{10} - x_6x_{12}, x_{10}x_{11} - x_8x_{12}\rangle$. So the Hibi ring is $R = K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{12}]/I$. Here $m = 2, n = 3$. Therefore, the number of strip type generator is

$$\begin{aligned} S(2,3) =& \binom{2+1}{2} T(3) + \binom{3+1}{2} T(2) \\ =& 3.2\binom{3+1}{3} + 6.2\binom{2+1}{3} \\ =& 36 \end{aligned}$$

The total number of L-type generator is

$$\begin{aligned} L(2,3) =& \frac{L(2,2)L(2,3)}{2} \\ =& 8. \end{aligned}$$

Since the no.of L-type generator=the no. of box type generator=8. Hence the first betti number of Hibi ring is $= 36 + 8 + 8 = 52$. We can also verify this example using Macaulay2, which is the following

```
i1 : kk=QQ

o1 = QQ

o1 : Ring

i2 :  R=kk[x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5,x_6,x_7,x_8,x_9,x_10,x_11,x_12];

i3 :  p=ideal(x_2*x_3-x_1*x_5,x_2*x_6-x_1*x_8,x_2*x_9-x_1*x_11,x_3*x_4-x_1*x_7,x
_4*x_5-x_2*x_7,x_4*x_6-x_1*x_10,x_4*x_8-x_2*x_10,x_4*x_9-x_1*x_12,x_4*x_11-x_2*x
_12,x_5*x_6-x_3*x_8,x_5*x_9-x_3*x_11,x_6*x_7-x_3*x_10,x_7*x_8-x_5*x_10,x_7*x_9-x
_3*x_12,x_7*x_11-x_5*x_12,x_8*x_9-x_6*x_11,x_9*x_10-x_6*x_12,x_10*x_11-x_8*x_12)
;

o3 : Ideal of R

i4 : fp=res p

      1      18      52      60      34      12      3
o4 = R  <-- R   <-- R   <-- R   <-- R   <-- R   <-- R  <-- 0

     0      1       2       3       4       5       6      7
```

5.10 First Betti number of planar distributive lattice

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a planar distributive lattice and JM be the set of all join-meet irreducible elements of $\mathcal{L}$. Let $D_{(\theta_i,\theta_j)} = [\theta_i \wedge \theta_j, \theta_i \vee \theta_j]$, the interval for $\theta_i \nsim \theta_j, \theta_i, \theta_j \in JM$. One can write the lattice $\mathcal{L}$ as a union of these intervals. Let $n(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ be the number of strip type generator in $D_{(\theta_1,\theta_2)}$. Then we have the following

Lemma 5.11. *For $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in JM$, then $n(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is the following*

$$n(\theta_1, \theta_2) = S(ht(\theta_1) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2), ht(\theta_2) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2)).$$

Where $S(.,.)$ is the number of strip type generator from the grid lattice.

Proof: Since the grid lattice formed by $D_{(\theta_1,\theta_2)}$ is the lattice $G(ht(\theta_1) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2), ht(\theta_2) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2))$. Hence by the lemma(5.4) it follows.

Lemma 5.12. *For a planar distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$, the number of strip type generator of $R[\mathcal{L}]$, we denote it by $n(S)$ is the following*

$$n(S) = \sum_{\substack{\theta_i \nsim \theta_j \\ \theta_i, \theta_j \in JM}} n(\theta_i, \theta_j) - \sum_{\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k} n(\theta_i \vee (\theta_j \wedge \theta_k), \theta_j).$$



Figure 17:

Proof: From the figure (17) it follows.
Let $m(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ be the number of L-type generator in $D_{(\theta_1,\theta_2)}$. Then we have the following

Lemma 5.13. *For $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in JM$, then $m(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is the following*

$$m(\theta_1, \theta_2) = L(ht(\theta_1) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2), ht(\theta_2) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2)).$$

Where $L(.,.)$ denotes the number of L-shape generator from the grid lattice.

Proof: The lemma is clearly follows from the lemma(5.6).

Lemma 5.14. *For a planar distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$, the number of L-type generator of $R[\mathcal{L}]$, we denote it by $n(L)$ is the following*

$$\begin{aligned} n(L) = & \sum_{\substack{\theta_i \nsim \theta_j \\ \theta_1, \theta_j \in JM}} m(\theta_i, \theta_j) - \sum m(r, s) \\ & + \sum_{\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k} (ht(\theta_j \vee \theta_k) - ht(\theta_i \vee \theta_j)(ht(\theta_j \wedge \theta_k) - ht(\theta_i \wedge \theta_j)) \binom{r+1}{2} \binom{s+1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

where $r = ht(\theta_i \vee \theta_j) - ht(\theta_j), s = ht(\theta_j) - ht(\theta_j \wedge \theta_k)$.



Figure 18:

Proof: The number of L-type for each $D_{(\theta_i,\theta_j)}$ is $m(\theta_i,\theta_j)$. For each $\theta_i,\theta_j,\theta_k$ there is double counting $m(r,s)$ where $r = ht(\theta_i \vee \theta_j) - ht(\theta_j), s = ht(\theta_j) - ht(\theta_j \wedge \theta_k)$. Also for each $\theta_i,\theta_j,\theta_k$ there is a L-type (see the dotted line in the the figure(18)) and the number is $(ht(\theta_j \vee \theta_k) - ht(\theta_i \vee \theta_j)(ht(\theta_j \wedge \theta_k) - ht(\theta_i \wedge \theta_j))\binom{r+1}{2}\binom{s+1}{2}$. Since for $(\theta_i,\theta_j),(\theta_j,\theta_k),(\theta_k,\theta_l)$ thete is no L-type. Hence the lemma follows.

Let $B(\theta_1,\theta_2)$ be the number of box type in $D_{(\theta_1,\theta_2)}$ then we have the following:

Lemma 5.15. *For a planar distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$, the number of box type generator of $R[\mathcal{L}]$, $n(B)$ is given by*

$$n(B) = \sum_{\substack{\theta_i \nsim \theta_j \\ \theta_1,\theta_j \in JM}} B(\theta_i,\theta_j) - \sum_{\theta_i,\theta_j,\theta_k} B(\theta_i \vee (\theta_j \wedge \theta_k),\theta_j).$$

Proof: For each θ_i,θ_j the number of box types is $B(\theta_i,\theta_j)$ and for each $\theta_i,\theta_j,\theta_k$ there is double countings $B(\theta_i \vee (\theta_j \wedge \theta_k),\theta_j)$ in numbers in their intersections. Hence the lemma follows.
Definition: Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, then we say these two diamonds are comparable if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_1 \leq \alpha_2, \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$. If at least one of these pairs is not comparable we say $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2)$ are non- comparable.

Lemma 5.16. *Let $(\alpha_1,\beta_1),(\alpha_2,\beta_2) \in \mathcal{D}_2$, the diamond type arrising out of these two diamonds is expressed by strip, L, box types (infact only L-type) if only if*

1. *The diamonds are non-comparable or,*
2. *There exist a diamond $(\alpha_3,\beta_3) \in \mathcal{D}_2$ such that there is a sublattice (19)*



Figure 19:

Proof:$\Leftarrow$: This follows from the lemma(4.14).



Figure 20:

$\Rightarrow$: Let there does not exist $(\alpha_3, \beta_3) \in \mathcal{D}_2$ such that there is no sublattice (19) and let $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ are comparable, then we prove that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ are not expressible. The element $(x_{\alpha_2}x_{\beta_2} - x_{\alpha_2\vee\beta_2}x_{\alpha_2\wedge\beta_2})g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)} - (x_{\alpha_1}x_{\beta_1} - x_{\alpha_1\vee\beta_1}x_{\alpha_1\wedge\beta_1})g_{(\alpha_2,\beta_2)}$ can be expressed by other type of generators if there exist a diagram like figure (20), by lemma(4.14). Now we will show for maximal sublattices this can not be express. Let either the diamond (a) or (b) is missing, let say (a) is missing. Then $x_{\alpha_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}$ or $x_{\beta_2}g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}$ is a term of a syzygy generator. But from the figure we see that the coefficient of $g_{(\alpha_1,\beta_1)}$ could only be the points which are bolded in the figure and we see that x_{α_2} or x_{β_2} is not there. Thus this element cannot be expressed as a combination of other type of syzygy genrators. Similarly, we can show that if the diamond (b) is not there then the element cannot be expressed in terms of other types of generators. Hence the lemma follows.

Remark: This lemma will help us to find the number of diamond type generator for a planar distributive lattice. Let $n(D)$ be the number of diamond type generators. Then we have the following formula for the first Betti number.

Theorem 5.17. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a planar distributive lattice such that the condition of the lemma(5.16) holds. Then the first syzygy of the Hibi ring $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is linear.*

Proof: This theorem follows from the lemma 5.16. Since any diamond type generator can be expressed by other type of generators (linear).

Theorem 5.18. *The first Betti number $\beta_1(L)$ of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is*

$$\beta_1(\mathcal{L}) = n(S) + n(L) + n(B) + n(D).$$

Proof:It follows from the lemmas 5.12,5.14,5.15 and 5.16.

Let $k(\mathcal{L}) = \#\{(\theta_i, \theta_j) : \theta_i \nsim \theta_j, \theta_i, \theta_j \in JM\}$.

Theorem 5.19. *With above notations we have the following*

1. *When $k(\mathcal{L}) = 1$, the first syzygy of $R[\mathcal{L}]$ is linear.*
2. *When $k(\mathcal{L}) = 2$,*
   (a) *If the lattice is (21), then first syzygy is non linear.*
   (b) *Else if the lattice is (22) then first syzygy is linear if and only if $ht(\theta_2\wedge\theta_3) - ht(\theta_1\wedge\theta_2) = 1$ or $ht(\theta_2 \vee \theta_3) - ht(\theta_1 \vee \theta_2) = 1$, where $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in JM$.*

3. If $k(\mathcal{L}) \geq 3$ then the first syzygy is non linear.

Proof:

1. Since $k(\mathcal{L}) = 1$ then it is always a grid lattice. By lemma 5.16 it is linear.



Figure 21:

2. (a) If the lattice is (21), then the first syzygy have diamond type generators such as $(x_{\theta_3}x_{\theta_4} - x_{\theta_3\vee\theta_4}x_{\theta_3\wedge\theta_4})g_{(\theta_1,\theta_2)} - (x_{\theta_1}x_{\theta_2} - x_{\theta_1\vee\theta_2}x_{\theta_1\wedge\theta_2})g_{(\theta_3,\theta_4)}$ and it cannot be expressed by other types of generators, by lemma (5.16). Hence it is non linear.



Figure 22:

(b) $\Rightarrow$: If the lattice is (22) and since first syzygy is linear then by lemma(5.16) there is a sublattice (19) and therefore $ht(\theta_2 \wedge \theta_3) - ht(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2) = 1$ or $ht(\theta_2 \vee \theta_3) - ht(\theta_1 \vee \theta_2) = 1$, where $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in JM$.
$\Leftarrow$: Let the condition holds then all diamond type elements of the first syzygy can be expressed by other types. Hence the first syzygy is linear.



Figure 23:

3. If $k(\mathcal{L}) \geq 3$ then we have a figure like (23), then the first syzygy element coming from the lower diamond and upper diamond cannot be expressed by other type of syzygies. Hence diamond type elements will occur. Thus for this case the first syzygy is not linear.

Acknowledgement

The corresponding author thanks University Grants Commission(UGC) for financial support and Dept. of Mathematics of Bits-Pilani Goa campus for hospitality.

References

[1] D. Eisenbud, Commutative algebra with a view towards algebraic geometry, Grad. Texts in Math., 150, Springer, Berlin, 1995.

[2] I. Peeva, Graded syzygies, Algebr Appl. 14, Springer, New York, 2011.

[3] Eisenbud, David, The geometry of syzygies. A second course in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 229. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

[4] V.Lakshmibai, H. Mukherjee; Standard Monomial bases for tangent cones at singular points on Hibi toric varieties, preprint.

[5] Ene, Viviana; Syzygies of Hibi Rings. Acta Math. Vietnam. 40 (2015), no. 3, 403446.

[6] Garrett Birkhoff, Lattice Theory (1967), Colloquium Publications 25. Am. Math. Soc.

[7] Cox, David A., John Little, and Donal O'shea. Using algebraic geometry. Vol. 185. Springer Science and Business Media, 2006.

[8] Hibi, Takayuki, Distributive lattices, affine semigroup rings and algebras with straightening laws. Commutative algebra and combinatorics (Kyoto, 1985), 93109, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 11, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.

[9] Herzog, Jrgen; Hibi, Takayuki, Monomial ideals. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 260. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.

[10] V.Lakshmibai, Mukherjee, H; Singular loci of Hibi toric varieties, Journal of Ramanujan Math soc. volume 26,(2011), 1-29.

[11] Ene, Viviana; Herzog, Jrgen; Saeedi Madani, Sara A note on the regularity of Hibi rings. Manuscripta Math. 148 (2015), no. 3-4, 501506.

[12] C. De Concini, D. Eisenbud and C. Procesi: Hodge algebras, Asterisque 91 (1982).

[13] Kummini, Manoj; Lakshmibai, Venkatramani; Sastry, Pramathanath; Seshadri, C. S. Free resolutions of some Schubert singularities. Pacific J. Math. 279 (2015), no. 1-2, 299328.

[14] R.P.Stanley, Enumerative combinatorics, vol.1, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,1996.

[15] N. Gonciulea, V.Lakshmibai; Singular Loci of Ladder Determinantal Varieties and Schubert Varieties, Journal of algebra, volume 229, 2000, 463-497.

[16] Hilbert, David. Uber die Theorie der algebraischen Formen, Mathematische annalen 36.4 (1890): 473-534.

[17] Wagner, David G. "Singularities of toric varieties associated with finite distributive lattices." Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics 5.2 (1996): 149-166.

[18] Ene, Viviana; Qureshi, Ayesha Asloob; Rauf, Asia; Regularity of join-meet ideals of distributive lattices. Electron. J. Combin. **20** (**2013**), no. 3, Paper 20, 8 pp.

[19] Brown, Justin A., and V. Lakshmibai. "Singular loci of Grassmann-Hibi toric varieties." arXiv preprint math/0612289 (2006).

[20] J. Brown, V. Lakshmibai; Singular loci of Bruhat-Hibi toric varieties, Journal of Algebra, Volume 319, Issue 11, 1 June 2008, Pages 4759-4779.

[21] Lakshmibai, Venkatramani, and Reuven Hodges. "Free resolutions of some Schubert singularities in the Lagrangian Grassmannian. " Pacific Journal of Mathematics 279.1 (2015): 329-355.